



Empowerment and Participation: How could the wide range of social effects of participatory approaches be better elicited and compared?

Patrick d'Aquino
March 2007
Cirad, France
daquino@cirad.fr

FIRST PART:

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SYNTHESIS

I. Participatory approaches, questions as yet unanswered.

1. The importance of the stakeholders' involvement.

The relations between science and society have become more tricky, especially at the field level, between technical advisors and stakeholders, as well as the international level, between experts and civil and political leaders, because the stakes set to science grow in complexity and uncertainty. Scientists are faced with developmental, environmental or social questions that depend on the cultural context and the logics and behaviors of stakeholders. On the theoretical level, this evolution leads to considerable changes in scientific (Functowicz 1994) and politics (Rawls 1999, Habermas 2001, Sen 1999) thinking. On a practical level, it reasserts the call for better methods to involve societal stakeholders in the ongoing dialogue of their future.

Consequently, community and participatory approaches are still an important way to ensure the involvement of stakeholders and citizens. We mean participation to include any process that helps individuals influence the decision-making that affects them and plays a role in these decisions (World Bank 1996), from the construction of public policy to the selection of an adapted technology. The main methodological goal is a then wider sharing of representations and goals among the various actors involved, but depending on the approach, the respective weight of the viewpoints of local actors and intervening people may vary:

- (i) for some people, participation means an exchange of viewpoints, with the main objective being the transfer of one's own analysis (*awareness-raising*) to the targeted actors;
- (j) for others, participation means going beyond this exchange of view points to build a common vision, which requires that each one agree to modify his initial analysis (*participatory appraisal*);
- (j) the participation time limit is also used by approaches intended to share the different tasks and responsibilities involved in the management of a resource, area or chain of production with the targeted actors,... (*collaborative management*);
- (k) finally, participation can also define a shared pre-management decision making process concerned with prioritizing values and goals to be dealt with subsequently (*participative democracy*). Thus, an integrated management approach means cooperatively managing an animal reserve, whereas a participatory decision process means making a joint decision as to whether or not the priority is to plan reserves and, if so, where to locate them.

Nevertheless, these approaches are still faced with questions about their effectiveness and relevance despite the fact that they have been tested over the past quarter century and have led to compelling changes in the design, implementation, and policies of development programs (Scoones et Thompson 1993, Bhasin 1998, Nguingiri 1998, Michener 1998, Lamerlink et Wolffers 1998, Alff et Bauer 1999, Cleaver 1999, Innes et Booher 1999, Lazarev et Arab 2002,

Kumar et Kapoor 2003, Neef 2005, Froger et al 2005). Thus, although numerous evaluations and comparative analyses have been carried out (Arnstein 1969, Boiral et al 1985, Nelson et Wright 1995, Agrawal et Gibson 1999, Cleaver 1999, Innes et Booher 1999, Lavigne-Delville et al 2000, Carr et Halvorsen 2001, Gaventa 2002, Conley et Moote 2003, Kumar et Kapoor 2003, Mansuri et Rao 2004, World Bank, 2005,...), it remains difficult to define a non partisan way to set objectives and limits of the different ways to consider participation. Consequently, it has been difficult to prove the efficiency of these approaches, therefore improving their spreading but also limiting general use of these innovations and experiences.

That is why it is important to develop a common framework for participatory approaches, taking into account their different understandings of stakeholders, objectives, forms and limits. This will lead to a more rigorous and pragmatic way to propose to development policies as well as research action proponents some clear and practical positioning of participation, face to the critical questionings.

2. Criticism relevant to participation

First of all, regardless of their site of intervention, participatory approaches must always be dealt with in a context of social hierarchy, involving disadvantaged groups whose points of view and needs are not always recognized by the local community and then could be neglected during local workshops (Nelson et Wright 1995, Agrawal et Gibson 1999, Schneider 1999, Lavigne-Delville et al 2000, Edmunds et Wollenberg 2002, Abraham et Platteau 2004). Furthermore, the decision processes are never limited to the public eye alone, with a significant part taking place *behind the scenes* (Goffmann 1979), depending on the varying modes of different societies. Lastly, collective discussion is the ideal place for social monitoring to occur, from setting the stage to affirmation of power, with choices being more dependent on mediation of power struggles than on mutual, rational cooperation (Lavigne Delville et Mathieu 2000, Mansuri et Rao 2004, Faysse 2006). Complexity of the social and political context dependent on social relations and positions of power between members of the community, underlying social and cultural stakes of each stakeholder and group involved, attitude of the existing powers and other social groups, nature of conventional and cultural forms behind social and political practices,... (Bierschenk 1988, Olivier de Sardan 1992, Jacob et Lavigne Delville 1994, De Carlo 1999, Borri-Feyerabend *et al* 2004). This is the whole issue of the integration, adaptation, and dissemination of an innovation within a community, and these are always very dependent on the social context and the status of individuals involved (Boiral et al 1985, Olivier de Sardan et Pacquot 1991, Olivier de Sardan 1992). Failure to acknowledge this social reality opens up an area for recovery that certain people, in particular the local better off, backed up by the steps, can get a hold of in order to strengthen their control over the groups (Narayan et Ebbe 1997, Ribot 1998, Cleaver 1999, Agrawal 2003, World Bank 2004, World Bank 2005b). Practitioners might think they are changing modes of cooperation or social institutions, when they really have only aided in the recasting in a new context of the existing roles and statuses, whether it be among technicians and civil society or among local leaders and inhabitants. Furthermore, regardless of the method, it can be manipulated based on the goals of the facilitator or local better-off (Gibson et Marks 1995, Desai 1996, van der Linden 1997, Ribot 1998 et 2001, Dahl-Ostergaard et al 2003, Mansuri et Rao 2004), which are linked to his social position, his professional expertise, his personal goals and his political ideals (Rosenau 1990, 33).

All of this entails a series of questions vis-à-vis participatory steps: How can an intervention obtain the level of knowledge of the social milieu required to bring about sustainable changes without long and uncertain sociological studies? How can we insure that the chosen target populations are appropriate to achieve social evolutions? But what are these resulting social outcomes being sought for the local society, given that the intervention will be more or less effective based on the status of the target population under consideration and that the roles and responsibilities of the various actors in a society, or in other words, the representative groups to be targeted, are actually difficult to discover¹ (Kumar et Kapoor 2003, World Bank 2005a)? Do we allow the leaders to express themselves, thus reproducing social differentiations² or intervene on behalf of a socially excluded group, thus acting against the social organization of the community, running the risk of eradicating the sustainable change being sought in the local setting? How can we avoid facilitators of these approaches going off course? Participation implies a major change in the way public decision-making, development and research are carried out. Support services and external partners lack the qualifications and expertise necessary for this change. Rather than trying to apply a standardized methodology, what is needed is a skill and a "posture" that are difficult to formalize, select, and disseminate (Lavigne Delville et Mathieu 2000, Borrini-Feyerabend et al 2004). Finally, how can achieve the dissemination of social and political outcomes beyond local scale when it is dependent on so many factors: social relations and the positions of power of the participants towards the other members of the community, the underlying social and cultural stakes of each stakeholder and group involved, the attitude of the existing powers and other social groups, the institutional background and the local development policies,...(Kumar 2003)? What strategy can be proposed to set in motion sustainable change within this entire context³, and not just for the workshop participants? How can public institutions and support services take interest in approaches that transfer part of their expertise to other stakeholders? Finally, how can better link local approaches, in direct touch with stakeholders, and macro policies of governance (Holmes et Scoones 2001, Pimbert 2004, Pozzoni et Kapoor 2005, Malena et al 2005) ?

The theoretical and practice construction of participation remains to be pursued, by way of better associating the long and rich experimental knowledge with a scattered but growing theoretical literature. More precautions need to be taken as regards ethics, values, and intentionality, because participatory methods can be used as much for instrumental purposes as for real empowerment of citizens. But it is also necessary to improve methods and tools in order to strengthen the bonds between "bottom up" participatory dynamics and the more institutional "top-down" methods of deliberation and decision-making (Nelson et Wright 1995, Webler 1999, Pimbert et Wakeford 2001, Neef 2005).

¹ Within an institution such as the World Bank, one will notice very different options with regard to target populations when going from one project to another, with no justification being given for these differences (World Bank 2005a).

² All the more so since to achieve success in organizing and mobilizing local actors, the pilot program must be one that is *deemed locally legitimate*, which will depend not only on the local social context, but also on the subject matter taken up and the reference scale: whether the same request will be validated will depend on whether one is dealing with the installation of some infrastructure in a village or the agreement among farmers and hunters in a region.

³ Cf. Institution building.

3. A change in stated objectives.

From sociopolitical changes to the development of cognitive capacities, the objectives and theoretical reference of participatory approaches have become progressively broader, in part to justify them vis-à-vis these criticisms. But this has not been enough to remove their ambiguities and prove their relevance and effectiveness once and for all (Sellamna 2000). Thus, a participatory approach immediately sets forth three different objectives which are emphasized to a greater or lesser degree depending on the approach: a modification in the distribution of power in a social group, improved decision making techniques for complex situations, and finally, development of skills in target populations.

The origins of participation are first and foremost in intervention with a social and political objective. It seeks to make relationships between individuals and social groups evolve to promote better actions and decisions (Freire 1970 et 1973, Sennett 1970). Then participatory methods are also used to help social groups to take charge of complex issues, from firm organization (Friedberg 1993) to sustainable development (de Montgolfier et Natali 1987, Mermet 1992, Weber 1992, Funtowicz et Ravetz 1994, Röling and de Jong 1998). Participatory processes are here useful for building a common perception in situations of change in rules and resource allocation where there are always potentially conflicting points of view at the outset. This kind of participatory methods refers to advances in applied social sciences⁴, particularly about group dynamics, in order to promote social and iterative construction of knowledge, which is achieved through the development collective capacities of adaptive management⁵ (Daniels et Walker 1996, Röling 1996, Ashby *et al.* 2000, Johnson *et al.* 2000, Carpenter et Gunderson 2001, Hagmann *et al.* 2002, Lynam *et al.* 2002, Borrini-Feyerabend *et al.* 2004, Gonsalves *et al.*, 2005).

However, it is difficult to envision a direct impact in these approaches on the natural and economic environment, since it is so difficult to link this kind of actions to changes in the state of environment (Conley et Moote 2003). Consequently, objectives of these approaches have been progressively targeted towards improvements in accommodation processes rather than measurable changes in the state of the environment, supported by a high assumption: a participatory approach is more effective than a directive from above in terms of finally achieving improved management of the economic and environmental situation, because the main obstacle to a better natural resources management is the lack of communication and quality information (Putnam 1993, Röling and Wagemakers 1998, Rao 2001, Borrini-Feyerabend *et al.* 2004). But that implies the progress in dealing with complexity noted by workshop participants can then be expressed and disseminated on a long-term basis throughout the entire community in question. The effective of participation thus also depends here on the social, political and cultural contexts

⁴ Pedagogy, organizational development, and community development, as participatory action research, experimental learning, systems thinking, chaos theory, and self-organization, to form the foundation for a growing family of approaches and methods geared toward collective action.

⁵ Cf. the "management centred" paradigm: concerned with transforming the way the forest is managed and seeks to achieve this through a transfer of responsibility with authority to the forest-local communities, in contrast with a benefit-centered paradigm. This is a power sharing rather than a product sharing process (Alden Wily and Mbaya 2001)

(Edmunds et Wollenberg 2001), which, for most approaches, are considered external factors and social prerequisites upon which they can have no effect.

This is why most approaches now focus on an intermediate objective, the capacity building for workshop participants (Ashby 1991, Chambers 1994b, Reijntjes *et al.* 1995, Conroy et al 1999, Hagmaan et al, 2002, Probst et al 2003, Borrini-Feyerabend et al. 2004). The objective is thus reduced to people directly touched by the approach⁶, rather than to all stakeholders and factors of a decision process, which, admittedly, cannot be controlled. The first weakness in these approaches is not having today a clear idea of their learning objectives, namely a specific description of target skills and setting up monitoring procedures for these learning processes... Nevertheless, this will not be enough to characterize the added value these approaches can have, in practice and in the long term, in disseminating an innovation, mobilizing users or technicians, putting new managers in place, and improving social and economic equity. For even if a learning process proves itself effective among participants, they still have to show their skills in the social, cultural and political game of the group or the society in question (Agrawal et Gibson 1999, Schneider 1999, Lavigne-Delville et al 2000, World Bank 2005a). The issue of effectiveness of these approaches again goes back to the social context, which it is believed the majority of them cannot or should not affect (Pena et Cuhna 1997, Cleaver 1999, d'Estree and Colby 2000, Kumar 2003, Borrini-Feyerabend et al. 2004, Gonsalves et al 2005).

4 Conclusion: two possible positions

Thus, regardless of the objective set forth, evaluators and most practitioners assess that the quality of the outcomes depends mainly on the social and political context as well as the human capacities of the facilitator and local leaders (Aronoff et Gunter 1994, Thompson 1995, Shepherd 1998, Krishna 2001, Kumar et Kapoor 2003, World Bank 2005a). So there are nowadays two options possible for people-centered approaches. The first is to give up setting forth the objective of effecting change on society, since that is dependent on too many uncontrollable social factors, and restrict the usefulness of participation to an improvement in knowledge of complex situations, arguing that complex systems can be effectively explored only through action coming from within the system⁷ (Crozier et Friedberg 1977, Hagmaan et al 2002). Using this perspective, participation is thus restricted more specifically to *a method for producing knowledge of a complex situation that associates actors in the system in question with the production of that knowledge*, without including social goals, since some social factors are seen as unattainable. This methodological way will be able to prove its efficiency for complex analysis, because people-centred analyses are often more cumbersome, and for some people more subjective, than more standard enquiry methods (Lavigne Delville et Mathieu 2000, Moiti-Maïzi 2000, Mansuri et Rao 2004).

The alternative is to preserve the objectives concerning the cooperative process or the democratization of society and therefore consider social, cultural, and political factors as the very targets of the approach rather than external elements or prerequisites. In that case, the only way

⁶ From informing people to change their behaviours to facilitating exchanges between various stakeholders: complexity appraising, managing diverging interests, adapting to uncertainty, organizational innovation...

⁷ Since only the system's reactions to changes can reveal its innermost characteristics. This knowledge is also highly useful in better understanding the perspective of the populations that are an integral part of this system

to respond to the criticism requires better defining a methodological approach which takes into account in a better explicit manner these social factors (Sellamna 1999, Conley et Moote 2003, Agrawal 2003, Probst et al. 2003, Neef 2005). Without this clearer positioning, participatory methods have not realistic objectives (as regards the local reality), neither means to achieve them (without a strategy enough strong in favor of such or such objective) and then that could remain an instrument with pernicious effects that each could use to his own ends.

This is why some practitioners and experts are getting together to exchange and build a more precise picture of the different possible empowerment and participation stakes, and of the different methodological avenues possible to reach these different stakes. This collective construction pursues three main objectives:

- it enables an improvement in rigor and effectiveness when implementing a given approach, by helping its designer to better formalize the goals of his approach⁸ and thus help its practitioners, as well as the assessment, to focus on them⁹;
- it makes it possible to pinpoint, among the various approaches and contexts, which pragmatic response elements each approach may use to confront the various criticisms (see *supra*) and which limitations have been set, so as to better target which approach is best adapted to a given intervention, based on the specific contextual goals;
- finally, it helps to clarify the specificities and possible complementary features among the approaches.

II. The challenge: positioning the social goals, effects and their limitations in a more explicit manner.

About their position as regards the social context, participatory methods are faced with two pitfalls: on one hand, they could drift within a militancy defending what it seems the only true participatory goals possible; on the other hand, they could remain in a technician's position by ignoring social aspects, thus reducing participation to a more efficient technique for communication, regardless of the social context. But even if the intervention is limited to an unique or thematic objective (technological innovation, support for a socially excluded group, restructuring of a support service, dealing with a conflict, common management of a specific resource,...), the social issue of participation, in the sense of a comprehensive view of the goals to which one hopes to contribute and the manner in which one hopes to influence them, cannot remain a fuzzy, shallow component (Chambers 1994b, Sellamna 1999, Pimbert *et al.* 2000).

⁸For more than ten years, research dealing with participation in the field of critical sociology has emphasized the importance of the social context and its complexity (Scoones and Thompson 1993, Sellamna 1999, Abraham and Platteau 2004, Neef 2005). But for now, knowledge of this context requires long, weighty research that few programs find feasible, and that, furthermore, needs to be repeated for each new context. In addition, these sociological analyses must be carried out with extreme rigor in order to produce data that is objective and tangible enough for creating an intervention model. Similarly, the goal of every intervention is always "subjective": it is a *choice* of values that favour goals *considered* to be fundamental, and which are then contextualized to respond to a *specific* analysis in the context of intervention.

⁹This kind of elicitation is also useful for developing the scaling up of the approach.

To gain validity requires taking a more explicit, methodological approach to this positioning by defining each intervention strategy in a more detailed and well-argued manner, so that it is *coherent, scientifically refutable and comparable*. Although significant progresses have been made in the last few years to better define outcomes (Lilja et Ashby 1999, Innes et Booher 1999, Lilja et al 2001), comparative analyses done up until now go no further than more often descriptive analyses of the various methodological variants, which have not brought forth enough data to distinguish points of view about empowerment¹⁰, yet behind the methodological constructions, and to assess their relevance as regards a given social and political context. Instead of trying to identify the panacea of participatory approaches or empowerment scale, it seems to us more useful today to precise for each method the social stakes which are perceived then aimed, for which it can be effective and evaluated, and the limitations it set, and for which it can be neither effective nor criticized.

Thus, one of the stakes today is to conceive a framework allowing people-centred approaches to elicit each own positioning as regards a given social context of intervention. This methodological framework will be as useful as conceivers as proponents who want to clarify (for partners or for themselves) their specific position towards social stakes, as well assessment experts trying to distinguish approaches and their complementarity. Face to this statement some practitioners and experts are getting together to exchange and build a more precise picture of the different possible empowerment and participation stakes, and of the different methodological avenues possible to reach these different stakes. This collective construction pursues three main objectives:

- it enables an improvement in rigor and effectiveness when implementing a given approach, by helping its designer to better formalize the goals of his approach¹¹ and thus help its practitioners, as well as the assessment, to focus on them¹²;
- it makes it possible to pinpoint, among the various approaches and contexts, which pragmatic response elements each approach may use to confront the various criticisms (see *supra*) and which limitations have been set, so as to better target which approach is best adapted to a given intervention, based on the specific contextual goals;
- finally, it helps to clarify the specificities and possible complementary features among the approaches.

¹⁰ Type de partage de la décision recherché à terme, processus sociologique choisi pour y parvenir, stratégie pour insérer les évolutions dans le contexte socio politique,...

¹¹For more than ten years, research dealing with participation in the field of critical sociology has emphasized the importance of the social context and its complexity. But for now, knowledge of this context requires long, weighty research that few programs find feasible, and that, furthermore, needs to be repeated for each new context. In addition, these sociological analyses must be carried out with extreme rigor in order to produce data that is objective and tangible enough for creating an intervention model. Similarly, the goal of every intervention is always “subjective”: it is a *choice* of values that favour goals *considered* to be fundamental, and which are then contextualized to respond to a *specific* analysis in the context of intervention.

¹²This kind of elicitation is also useful for developing the scaling up of the approach.

This emerging scientific network has planned to reach these objectives by an incremental exchange during the next three years between practitioners and experts around the world. This collective co construction is supported by regional workshops¹³ (West Africa, South East Asia, India, Oceania area, Europe, Latin America,...) and is sustained by a web site which regularly supplies bibliographical syntheses and comparative analyses of every participant's positioning about the relevant questionings towards participatory stakes and approaches, thanks to a collective using of a comparative framework to elicit and differentiate the participatory and empowerment stakes every participant pursues in his peculiar context. We also plan to present the group's works to some external experts in social sciences and development policies, for debating.

¹³ The first workshop has been held on July 2007.

Bibliographical References

- Abraham, A. and J.-P. Platteau (2004). Participatory development: where culture creeps. Culture and public action. V. Rao and M. Walton. Stanford, Stanford Social Sciences: 442.
- Adorno, T. W., E. Frenkel-Brunswok, et al. (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York, Harper Row.
- Agrawal, A. (2003). "Sustainable governance of common-pool resources: context, methods, and politics." Annual Review of Anthropology **32**: 243-262.
- Agrawal, A. and C. C. Gibson (1999). "Enchantment and disenchantment: the role of community in natural resource conservation." World Development **27**(4): 629-649.
- Alden Wily, L. and S. Mbaya (2001). Land, People and Forests in Eastern and Southern Africa at the beginning of the 21st century. The impact of land relations on the role of communities in forest future. Natural Resources International. IUCN. Nairobi.
- Alff, U., P. Ay, et al. (1999). "The end of participation? A contribution to the state of the discussion." Beraterinnen-News **1**: 17-19.
- Antona, M. and D. Babin (2001). "Multiple Interest Accomodation in African Forestry Management Projects: Between Pragmatism and Theoretical Coherence." International Journal of Agricultural Resources, Governance and Ecology **1**(3/4): 145-164.
- Armstrong, J., F. Carden, et al. (2000). IMFNS outcomes assessment, IDRC.
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). "A ladder of citizen participation." Journal of the American Institute of Planners **35**: 216-224.
- Aronoff, M. and V. Gunter (1994). "A pound of cure: facilitating participatory processes in technological hazard disputes." Society and National resources **7**: 235-252.
- Arts, B. and P. Verschuren (1999). "Assessing political influence in complex decision-making: an instrument based on triangulation." International Political Science Review **20**(4): 411-424.
- Asaro, P. M. (1996). Transforming Society by Transforming Technology: The Science and Politics of Participatory Design. Urbana, University of Illinois Press.
- Ashby, J. A. (1991). Evaluating technology with farmers.
- Ashby, J. A. (1991). Small Farmers' Participation in the design of technologies. Agroecology and Small Farm Development. M. A. Altieri and S. B. Hecht, CRC Press: 245-253.
- Ashby, J. A., A. Braun, et al. (2000). Investing in farmers as researchers: experience with Local Agricultural Research Committees in Latin America, CIAT.
- Babin, D. and A. Bertrand (1998). "Managing pluralism: subsidiarity and patrimonial mediation." Unasylva **49**: 19-25.
- Balka, E. (1997). "Participatory Design in Women's Organizations: The Social World of Organizational Structure and Gendered Nature of Expertise." Gender, Work and Organizations **4**(2): 99-115.
- Barber, B. (1984). Strong democracy: participatory politics for a new age. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Baume, E., M. Juarez, et al. (2001). Gender and health equity resource guide. Brighton, Institute of Development Studies.
- Baun, R., B. Baker, et al. (1996). Sustainable communities checklist, University of Washington, Northwest Policy Center, Seattle.

- Becker, H. A. and F. Vanclay The international handbook of social impact assessment. Conceptual and methodological advances., Edward Elgar Publishing
- Becker, J. (2004). "Making sustainable development evaluations. Work in."
- Beetham, D., S. Vracking, et al. (2001). Handbook on democracy assessment. The Hague, Kluwer Law International.
- Benh, R. (2001). Rethinking democratic accountability. Washington, Brookings Institute.
- Beuret, J. E. (2005). La conduite de la concertation pour la gestion de l'environnement et le partage des ressources, INRA, L'Harmattan.
- Bhasin, K. (1998). Are we on the right track? Report of a workshop on participatory evaluation. Knowledge shared: participatory evaluation in development cooperation. West Hartford, Kumarian Press Inc: 85-94.
- Bierschenk, T. (1998). "Development Project as arenas of negociation for strategic groups." Sociologia Ruralis **2-3**: 146-160.
- Biggs, S. (1989). Resource-poor farmer participation in research: a synthesis of experiences from international agricultural research systems. La Hague, ISNAR.
- Bingham, G. (1986). Resolving environmental disputes: a decade of experiences., Conservation Foudation, Washington DC.
- Blauert, J. and J. Dietz (2004). Of dreams and shadows. The case of the Mexican regional sustainable development programme, IIED, IDS.
- Boal, A. (1992). Games for Actors and Non-Actors. London, Routledge.
- Boiral, P., J. F. Lanteri, et al. (1985). Paysans, experts et chercheurs en Afrique noire. Sciences sociales et développemen rural., CIFACE, Karthala, Paris.
- Boltanski, L. and L. Thévenot (1989). De la justification: les économies de grandeur. Paris, Gallimard.
- Boon, T. E. (1999). Five analytical frameworks for analysing public participation. Regional forest programmes: a participatory approach to support forest based regional development.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G., A. Kothari, et al. (2004). Indigenous and local communities and protected areas. Towards equity and enhanced conservation., IUCN.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G., M. Pimbert, et al. (2004). Sharing Power. Learning by doing in co-management of natural resources throughout the world. Cenesta, Tehran, IIED, IUCN/CEESP/CMWG.
- Bourdieu, P. (1980). "Le capital social: notes provisoires." Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales **31**: 2-3.
- Bourdieu, P. (1980). Le sens pratique. Paris, Minuit.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992). Pour une anthropologie réflexive. Paris, Le Seuil.
- Bourdieu, P. (1994). Raisons pratiques. Sur une théorie de l'action. Paris, Seuil.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). Propos sur le champ politique. Lyon, Presses Universitaires de Lyon.
- Bousquet, F., G. Trebuil, et al. (2005). Companion modeling and multi-agent systems for integrated naturel raseource management in Asia. Los Banos, IRRI.

- Brewer, G. D. (1986). Methods for synthesis: policy exercises. Sustainable development of the biosphere: themes for a research program. Clark. and Munn. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 5-48.
- Brewer, M. B. and D. T. Campbell (1976). Ethnocentrism and inter group attitudes: East African evidence. New York, Sage.
- Bruch, C. and M. Filbey (2002). Emerging global norms in public involvement. The new "Public": the globalisation of Public Participation. C. Bruch. Washington DC, Environmental law Institute.
- Brunson, M. W. (2000). "Observing vs. doing: a researcher learns about collaboration." Chron.Comm. **4**,(2): 47-52.
- Calderon, F. and A. Szmukler (2004). Political culture and development. Culture and public action. V. Rao and M. Walton. Stanford, Stanford Social Sciences: 442.
- Candler, W. and N. Kumar (1998). The Dairy revolution: the impact of dairy developpement in India and the World Bank's contribution., OED Study Series, World Bank, Washington DC.
- Carpenter, S. R. and L. H. Gunderson (2001). "Coping with collapse: ecological and social dynamics in ecosystem management." BioScience **51**: 451-457.
- Carr, D. S. and K. Halvorsen (2001). "An evaluation of three democratic, community-based approaches to citizen participation: surveys, conversations with community groups, and community dinners." Society and Natural resources, **14**: 107-126.
- Carr, D. S., S. W. Selin, et al. (1998). "Managin public forest: understanding the role of collaborative planning." Envir.Manag., **22**(5): 767-776.
- Carrol, J. (1991). Designing Interaction: Psychological theory at the human-computer interface. New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Carrol, J. (1995). Scenario-Based Design. New York, John Wiley & Sons.
- Cefai, D. (2000). "La construction des problèmes publics: définition de situations dans les arènes publiques." Journal Réseaux.
- Chambers, R. (1994). "The origins and practice of Participatory Rural Appraisal." World Development **22**(7): 953-969.
- Chambers, R. (1994). "PRA: Challenges, potentials and paradigm." World Development **22**(10): 1437-1454.
- Chauveau, J. P. (1994). Participation paysanne et populisme bureaucratique. Essai d'histoire et de sociologie du développement. Les associations paysannes en Afrique. J. P. Jacob and P. Lavigne-Delville. Paris, APAD, Karthala: 221-234.
- Chogull, M. and B. Guaraldo (1996). "A ladder of community participation for underdeveloped countries." Habitat International **20**(3): 431-444.
- Clarke, S. E. (1995). "Institutional logic's and local economic development: a comparative analysis of eight American cities." Intern Jrnl of Urb and Reg Plan, **4**: 513-533.
- Cleaver and F. (1999). "Paradoxes of participation: questioning participatory approaches to developpement." Journal of Intern Developpement **11**: 597-612.
- Coglianesi, C. (1999.). "The limits of consensus." Environnement **41**(3): 28-33.

Conley, A. and M. A. Moote (2003). "Evaluating Collaborative Natural Resource Management." Society and Natural resources, **16**: 371-386.

Conroy, C., A. Sutherland, et al. (1999). Conducting farmer participatory research: what, when and how. Decision-tools-for-sustainable-development. N. R. Institute. Chatham, Natural Resources Institute.

Corniaux, C., P. D'Aquino, et al. (2003). Towards an adaptation of rangelands management and scientists interventions in a new agro-pastoral context. Case study in rice-based farming systems in the Delta of Senegal River. VIIème International Rangeland Congress, Durban.

Cornwall, A. and J. Gaventa (2000). "From users and choosers to makers and shapers: repositioning participation in social policy." IDS Bulletin **31**(4): 50-62.

Cornwall, A. and J. Gaventa (2001). "Bridging the gap: citizenship, partnership and accountability. Deliberative democracy and citizen empowerment." PLA notes **40**: 32-35.

Crook, R. and J. Manor (2000). Democratic decentralization. Washington DC, World Bank.

Crozier, M. and E. Friedberg (1977). L'acteur et le système., La seuil, Paris.

d'Aquino, P. (1998). "Quels choix fonciers en zone agropastorale sahélienne?" Tiers-Monde **39**(153): 175-188.

d'Aquino, P. (2001). "Ni planification locale, ni aménagement du territoire: pour une nouvelle approche de la planification territoriale." Géographie, Économie, Société **3**(2): 279-299.

d'Aquino, P. (2002). Accompagner une maîtrise ascendante des territoires. Prémisses d'une géographie de l'action territoriale. Département de Géographie. Aix en Provence, Université d'Aix Marseille. **HDR**: 323.

d'Aquino, P. (2002). Gestion décentralisée de territoire: pour une animation inter institutionnelle plutôt qu'un appui direct à la planification locale. L'Europe et le Sud à l'aube du 21ème siècle: enjeux et renouvellement de la coopération. Actes de la 9ème Conférence générale de l'Association Européenne des Instituts de Recherche et de Formation en matière de développement, Paris, EADI.

d'Aquino, P. (2002). "Le pouvoir plutôt que la participation. Les principes d'une nouvelle approche de la planification territoriale décentralisée." Géographie, Économie, Société **4**(1): 57-68.

d'Aquino, P., R. Brunet, et al. (2002). "Débat: le local, le territoire et la planification ascendante." L'Espace Géographique **1**: 38-49.

d'Aquino, P., C. Le Page, et al. (2002). "A novel mediating participatory modeling: the "self-design" process to accompany a collective decision-making." International Journal of Agriculture and Ressources Governance and Ecology (IJARGE) **2**(1): 59-74.

d'Aquino, P., C. Le Page, et al. (2003). "Using self-designed role-playing games and a multi-agent system to empower a local decision-making process for land use management: The SelfCormas experiment in Senegal." Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation **6**(3).

d'Aquino, P. and S. M. Seck (2002). "Et si les approches participatives étaient inadaptées à la gestion décentralisée de territoire?" Géocarrefour **76**(3): 233-240.

d'Aquino, P., S. M. Seck, et al. (1999). "Irrigation et développement régional: dix ans d'actions sur le fleuve Sénégal pour une planification régionale et décentralisée." Cahiers de la Recherche-Développement **45**: 77-84.

d'Aquino, P., S. M. Seck, et al. (2002). "Un SIG conçu par les acteurs: l'opération POAS au Sénégal." L'Espace Géographique **1**: 23-37.

d'Aquino, P., S. M. Seck, et al. (2002). " L'acteur avant l'expert: vers des systèmes d'information territoriaux endogènes. Résultats d'une expérience de cinq ans au Sénégal." Natures, Sciences, Sociétés **4**.

d'Estree, T. P. and B. G. Colby (2000). Guidebook for analysing success in environmental conflict resolution cases, Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Madison University, Fairfax.

Dahl-Ostergaard, Y., D. Moore, et al. (2003). Community-Driven rural development: What have we learned? Inter-American development bank sustainable development departement technical paper series, Washington DC.

Daniels, S. E. and W. B. Gregg (1996). "Collaborative learning: improving public deliberation in ecosystem-based management." Envir. Impact Asses. Rev. **16**: 71-102.

Das Gupta, M., H. Grandvoinnet, et al. (2000). State community synergies in development policy. Washington DC, World Bank.

Das Gupta, M. and I. Serageldin (1999). Social capital: a multifaceted perspective. Washington DC, World Bank.

Das Gupta, S. (1996). "A Decision Support System for Architects Based on Participatory Tools for Community Design." Environment and Urbanization **8**: 201-212.

Davies, R. and J. Dart (2005). The most significant change technique. A guide to its use, Care International, OXFAM.

Desai, V. (1996). "Access to power and participation." Third World Planning Review **18**(2): 217-242.

Douthwaite, B., J. M. Ekboir, et al. (2004). The concept of Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) and its implications for developing evaluation methods. Natural resource management in agriculture: methods for assessing economic and environmental impacts. B. Shiferaw, H. A. Freeman and S. M. Swinton: 321-339.

Douthwaite, B., T. Kuby, et al. (2003). "Impact pathway evaluation: an approach for achieving and attributing impact in complex systems." Agricultural systems **78**(2): 243-265.

Duane, T. P. (1997). "Community participation in ecosystem management." Ecology Law Quarterly **24**(4): 771-797.

Duchrow, A. (2000). L'efficacité des méthodes participatives dans les activités de planification en Albanie, in Lavigne et al 2000.

Earl, S., F. Carden, et al. (2001). Outcome Mapping. Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programmes.

Edelenbos, J. and E.-H. Klijn (2005). "Managing stakeholder involvement in decision making: a comparative analysis of six interactive processes in the Netherlands." Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory **16**(3): 417-446.

Edmunds, D. and E. Wollemberg (2001). "A Strategic Approach to Multistakeholder Negotiations." Development and Change **32**(231-253).

Edmunds, D. and E. Wollemberg (2002). Disadvantaged groups in multistakeholder negotiations. Bogor, CIFOR.

Estrella, M., J. Blauert, et al. (2000). Learning from change. Issues and experiences in participatory monitoring and evaluation.

Estrella, M. and J. Gaventa (1998). Who counts reality? Participatory monitoring and evaluation: a literature review, IDS Working Paper.

- Eyben, R. and S. Ladbury (1995). Popular participation in aid-assisted projects: why more in theory than practice? Power and participatory development theory and practice. J. M. Nelson and Wright, Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Farrel, A. and M. Hart (1998). "What does sustainability mean?" Environnement **49**(9): 26-31.
- Farrington, J. (1998). Farmers' participation in agricultural research and extension: lessons from the last decade, ODI.
- Faysse, N. (2006). "Troubles on the way: an analysis of the challenges faced by multi-stakeholders platforms." Natural resources Forum **30**: 219-229.
- Felicio, M. and I. John-Abraham (2004). Peru: towards a system of social accountability., Civil Society team, Latin and Caribbean Region.
- Fetterman, D. M. (2001). Foundations of empowerment evaluation, SAGE.
- Fetterman, D. M., Kaftarian, et al. (1996). Empowerment evaluation knowledge and tools for self-assessment and accountability.
- Fine, B. (1999). "The development state is dead-long live social capital?" Development and change **33**: 1-19.
- Finn, K. and J. Simonsen (1997). "Using ethnography in contextual design." Communications of the ACM **40**(7): 82-88.
- Fiorino, D. J. (1990). "Citizen participation et environmental risk: a survey of institutional mechanisms." Science, Technology & Human Values **15**(2): 226-243.
- Fisher, R., W. Ury, et al. (1991). Getting to yes: negotiating agreement without giving in. New York, Penguin.
- Forester, J. (1982). "Planning in the face of power." Journal of the American Planning Association: 6è-80.
- Forester, J. (1999). The deliberative practitioner. Cambridge, MIT Press.
- Fox, J. (1990). "The challenge of rural democratization." Journal of Development studies **26**(4).
- Freire, P. (1968). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York, The Seabury Press.
- Freire, P. (1973). Education for critical consciousness. New York, Continuum Publishing Company.
- Friedberg, E. (1993). Le pouvoir et la règle. Dynamique de l'action organisée. Paris, Seuil.
- Froger, G., C. Mainguy, et al. (2005). Quels acteurs pour quel développement? Paris, GEMDEV-Karthala.
- Fung, A. and E. O. Wright (2003). Deeping democracy: institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance., National University of Colombia Press.
- Funtowicz, S. O., J. Martienez-Alier, et al. (1999). Information tools for environmental policy under conditions of complexity. Luxembourg, European Communities.
- Funtowicz, S. O. and J. R. Ravetz (1994). "Emergent complex systems." Futures **26**: 568-582.
- Galasso, E. and M. Ravallion (2000). "Local knowledge vs.local accountability?" Decentralized targeting of an anti-poverty program World Bank, Development Research Group, Washington DC.
- Gaventa, J. (2002). "Exploring citizenship, participation and accountability." IDS Bulletin **3**(2).

- Germann, D., E. Gohl, et al. (1996). Participatory impact monitoring. Four booklets., GTZ.
- Gibson, C. C. and S. A. Marks (1995). "Transforming rural hunters into conservationists: an assessment of community-based wildlife management programs in Africa." World Development **23**(6): 941-957.
- Goetz, A. M. and J. Gaventa (2001). Bringing citizen voice and client focus into service delivery. Brighton, Institute of Development Studies.
- Goetz, A. M. and R. Jenkins (2001). "Hybrid forms of accountability: citizen engagement in institutions of public sector oversight in India." Public Management Review, **3**(3): 363-383.
- Goffman, E. (1979). La mise en scène de la vie quotidienne. 2. Les relations en public. Paris.
- Gonsalves, J., T. Becker, et al. (2005). Participatory research and development for sustainable agriculture and natural resource management. A sourcebook., CIP-UPWARD, IDRC, IFAD
- Greenbaum, J. and M. Kyng (1991). Design at Work: Cooperative Design of Computer Systems. Hillsdale, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hagmann, J., E. Chuma, et al. (2002). "Success factors in integrated natural resource management R&D – Lessons from practice." Conservation Ecology **5**(2): 29.
- Hamilton, N. A. (1995). Learning to learn with farmers A case study on an adult learning project conducted in Queensland, Wageningen. **Ph.D.**
- Harmmeijer, J., A. Waters Bayer, et al. (1999). Dimensions of participation in evaluation: experiences from Zimbabwe and the Sudan, IIED.
- Harris, T. and D. Weiner (1998). "Empowerment, marginalization, and "community-integrated" GIS." Cartography and Geographic Information Systems **25**(2): 67-76.
- Healey, P. (1997). Collaborative planning: shaping places in fragmented societies. London, MacMillan.
- Hoddinott, J., M. Adato, et al. (2000). Participation and poverty reduction: issues, theory and new evidence from South Africa. Washington DC, IFPRI.
- Holling, C. S., F. Berkes, et al. (1998). Science, sustainability and resource management. Linking social and ecological systems. Management practices and social mechanisms for building resilience. F. Berkes and C. Folke. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Holmes, T. and I. Scoones (2000). Participatory environmental policy processes. Experiences from north and south. Brighton, IDS.
- Horton, D., A. Alexaki, et al. (2003). Evaluating capacity development: experiences from research and development organizations around the world. The Hague, ISNAR.
- House, F. (1999). "Totem salmon: life lessons from another species." Beacon Press, Boston.
- Human, P. and A. Zaïman (1996). Gérer pour l'auto-suffisance. Sur l'efficacité des organisations en Afrique. Dakar, Institut de Gorée.
- Innes, J. E. and D. E. Booher (1999). "Consensus building and complex adaptive systems: a framework for evaluating collaborative planning." Journal of the American Planning Association **65**(4): 413-423.

Institute of Governance (2002). Governance principles for protected areas in the 21st century. Ottawa, Parks Canada.

Isham, J., D. Kaufmann, et al. (1997). "Civil liberties, democracy; and the performance of government projects." World Bank Economic Review **11**(2): 219-242.

Jackson, E. T. and Y. Kassam (1999). Knowledge shared: participatory evaluation in development cooperation. West Hartford, Kumarian Press.

Janssen, M. A. and E. Ostrom (2006). "Empirically based, agent-based models." Ecology and Society **11**(2): 37 [online].

Jimenez, E. and Y. Sawada (1998). Do community-managed schools work? An evaluation of El Salvador's EDUCO Program. Washington DC, World Bank.

Johnson, N., N. Lija, et al. (2000). Using participatory research and gender analysis in natural resource management: a preliminary analysis of the PRGA inventory, CIAT.

Jouve, B. (2006). "L'empowerment: entre mythe et réalités, entre espoir et désenchantement." Géographie, Economie, Société **8**: 5-15.

Katz, T. and J. Sara (1997). Making rural water supply sustainable: recommendations from a global study. Washington DC, United Nations Development Programme, World Bank.

Kaufmann, M. and H. Dilla Alfonso (1997). Community power and grassroots democracy. London, New Jersey, Zed Books.

Kenney, D. S. (1999). "Are community-based watershed groups really effective? Confronting the thorny issue of measuring success." Chron.Comm. **3**(2): 33-37.

Knack, S. and P. Keefer (1997). "Does social capital have an economic payoff? a cross-country investigation." Quarterly Journal of Economics: 1251-1288.

Kolb, D. A., J. S. Osland, et al. (1984). Organizational behaviour: an experiential approach, Prentice Hall.

Koppenjan, J. F. M. and E.-H. Klijn (2000). Interactive decision making and representative democracy: institutional collisions and solutions. Governance in Modern Society. O. van Heffen, W. J. M. Kickert and J. Thomassen. Dordrecht/Boston/London, Kluwer Academic Publishers: 109-134.

Korten, D. (1995). When corporations rule the world. West Hartford, Kumarian Press.

Krishna, A. (2001). "Moving from the stock of social capital to the flow of benefits: the role of agency." World Development **29**(6): 925-943.

Krishna, A. (2002). "Active social. Tracing the roots of development and democracy." Columbia University Press, New York.

Krishna, A., N. Uphoff, et al. (1997). Reasons for hope: instructive experiences in rural development, Kumarian, West Hartford CT.

Kumar, N. (2003). Community-Driven-Development: lessons from the Sahel. An analytical review. Washington DC, World Bank.

Kumar, N. and A. G. Kapoor (2003). Community-driven development. A study methodology, Operation Evaluation Department, World Bank.

- Kumar, N., N. Saxena, et al. (2000). India:alleviating poverty through forest developpement, Evaluation Country Case Series, OED,World Bank.
- La Porta, R., F. L. de Silanes, et al. (1997). "Trust in large organizations." American Economic Review **87**(2): 333-338.
- Laird, F. N. (1993). "Participatory Analysis, Democracy, and technological Decision Making." Science, Technology & Human Values **18**(3): 341-361.
- Lammerink, M. P. and I. Wolffers (1998). Approches participatives pour un développement durable, Karthala, IRD.
- Lavigne-Delville, P. (2000). L'illusion de tout découvrir au village:critique de l'empirisme dans les MARP. Les enquêtes participatives en débat. Ambition,pratiques,enjeux. Lavigne-Delville P. Sellamna N. E. Mathieu M.: 393-417.
- Lavigne-Delville, P. and M. Mathieu (2000). Donner corps aux ambitions: le diagnostic participatif comme enjeu de pouvoir et comme processus social. Les enquêtes participatives en débat. Ambition,pratiques,enjeux. Lavigne-Delville P. Sellamna N-E Mathieu M.: 497-536.
- Lavigne-Delville, P., N. E. Sellamna, et al. (2000). Les enquêtes participatives en débat. Ambition,pratiques,enjeux., GRET, Karthala, ICRA.
- Lazarev, G. and M. Arab (2002). Développement local et communautés rurales. Approches et instruments pour une dynamique de concertation., Karthala.
- Leach, M. (1991). "DELTA and village level planning in Sierra Leone: possibilities and pitfalls." RRA notes **11**: 42-44.
- Leach, W. D. and N. W. Pelkey (2000). "Laking watershed partnerships work: a review of the empiral literature." Journal. Water Res. Plan. Manag., **127**(6): 378-385.
- Lead Partnership Group (2000). "The Partnership Group identifies principales of community-based forestry." Lead Partnership Group Newsletter **4**(1): 1-2.
- Leuwis, C. and A. W. Van den Ban (2004). Communication for rural innovation. Rethinking agricultural extension. Oxford, Blackwell publishing Ltd.
- Levine, A. G. (1982). Love Canal: Science, Politics, and People. Lexington, Lexington Books.
- Lewin, K. (1948). Resolving social conflicts. New York, Harper Cllins.
- Leyens, J. P., V. Y. Yzerbyt, et al. (1994). Stereotypes and social cognition. London, Sage.
- Lilja, N. and J. A. Ashby (1999). Types of participatory research based on locus of decision making. Cali, CGIAR.
- Lilja, N., J. A. Ashby, et al. (2001). Assessing the Impact of Participatory Research and Gender Analysis, PRGA.
- Lusthaus, C., M.-H. Adrien, et al. (2002). Organizational assessment. A framework for improving performance. Washington DC, Ottawa, Inter Amerian Development Bank, IDRC.
- Lynam, T., F. Bousquet, et al. (2002). "Adapting science to adaptive managers: spidergrams, belief models, and multi-agent systems modeling." Conservation Ecology **5**(2): 2-24.
- Malena, C., R. Forster, et al. (2004). Social accountability: an introduction to the concept and emerging practice. Washington DC., World Bank.

- Mansbridge, J. (1980). Beyond adversarial democracy. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Mansuri, G. and V. Rao (2004). "Community-Based and -driven development: a critical review." World Bank Research Group **19**(1): 1-39.
- March, J. G. and P. G. Olsen (1989). Rediscovering institutions. New York, The Free Press.
- Martin, A. and J. Sherington (1997). "Participatory research methods - implementation, effectiveness and institutional context." Agricultural Systems **55**(2): 195-216.
- Mauss, M. (1960). "Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques." Sociologie et anthropologie.
- Mc Allister, K. and R. Vernooy (2003). Action and reflection: a guide for monitoring and evaluating participatory research. Ottawa, IDRC.
- Mc Dougall, C. and A. Braun (2003). Navigating complexity, diversity and dynamism: reflections on research for natural resource management. Managing natural resources for sustainable livelihoods: Uniting science and participation. B. Pound and al. Ottawa, IDRC.
- Mermet, L. (1992). Stratégies pour la gestion de l'environnement. La nature comme jeu de société? L'Harmattan.
- Mermet, L., R. Billé, et al. (2005). "L'analyse stratégique de la gestion environnementale: un cadre théorique pour penser l'efficacité en matière d'environnement." Natures, Sciences, Sociétés **13**: 127-137.
- Merrelyn, E. (1993). Participative Design for Participative Democracy. Canberra, The Australian National University.
- Michener, V. J. (1998). "The participatory approach: contradiction and co-option in Burkina Faso." World Development **26**(12): 2105-2118.
- Moiti-Maïzi, P. (2000). "Methodes et mécanismes participatifs dans un programme d'éco-développement." l'altérité à l'épreuve des faits: 97-117.
- Montgolfier (de), J. and J. M. Natali (1987). Le patrimoine du futur. Paros, Economica.
- Moote, M. A., M. P. McClaran, et al. (1997). "Theory in practice: applying participatory democracy theory to public land planning." Envir.Manag., **21**(6): 877-889.
- Narayan, D. (1995). The contribution of people's participation: evidence from 121 rural water supply projects. Washington DC, World Bank.
- Narayan, D. and K. Ebbe (1997). The design of social funds – Participation, demand orientation, and local organizational capacity. Washington DC, World Bank.
- Navarro, Z. (1998). "Participation, democratizing practices and the formation of a modern policy. The case of participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre, Brazil." Development and Change **41**: 68-71.
- Neef, A. (2005). Participatory approaches for sustainable land use in Southeast Asia. Bangkok, White Lotus.
- Nelson, J. M. and S. Wright (1995). Power and participatory development theory and practice. Bourton-on-Dunsmore, Intermediate Technology Development Group.
- Nguigui, J.-C. (1998). "Approche participative et développement local en Afrique subsaharienne: faut-il repenser la forme contemporaine du modèle participatif?" Bulletin Arbres, Forêts et Communautés Rurales **15-16**: 44-48.

- Nicolas, G. (1986). Don rituel et échange marchand dans une société sahélienne. Paris, Institut d'ethnologie.
- Olivier de Sardan, J. P. (1992). "Populisme développementiste et populisme en sciences sociales: idéologie, action, connaissance." Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines **120**: 475-492.
- Olivier de Sardan, J. P. and E. Paquot (1991). D'un savoir à l'autre. Les agents de développement comme médiateurs., GRET, La Documentation française, Ministère de la Coopération.
- Ollagnon, H. (1984). "Acteurs et patrimoine dans la gestion de la qualité des milieux naturels." Aménagement et Nature **74**.
- Ollagnon, H. (1989). Une approche patrimoniale de la qualité du milieu naturel. Du rural à l'environnement, la question de la nature aujourd'hui. N. Mathieu and M. Jollivet, L'Harmattan.
- Ostrom, E. (1989). Governing the Commons. The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action. London, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Ostrom, E. (1999). Social capital: a fad or a fundamental concept? Social capital: a multifaceted perspective. M. Das Gupta and I. Serageldin. Washington DC, World Bank.
- Paulson, D. D. (1998). "Collaborative management of public rangeland in Wyoming: lessons in co-management." Prof. Geographer **50**(3): 301-315.
- Pena, M. V. J. and P. V. da Cuhna (1997). The limits and merits of participation.
- Perroux, F. (1960). Économie et société. Contrainte, échange, don. Paris, PUF.
- Piaget, J. (1972). Épistémologie des sciences de l'homme. Paris, Gallimard.
- Pimbert, M. (2004). Institutionalising participation and people-centered processes in natural resource management Research and publications highlights. London, Brighton, IIED, IDS.
- Pimbert, M., V. Bainbridge, et al. (2000). Transforming bureaucracies: institutionalizing participation and people centred processes in natural resources management: an annotated bibliography. London, IIED.
- Pimbert, M. and T. Wakeford (2001). Deliberative democracy and citizen empowerment. London, IIED.
- Pimbert, M. and T. Wakeford (2003). "Prajateerpu, power and knowledge. The politics of participatory action research in development. Part 1. Context, process and safeguards." Action Research Series **1**(2): 184-207.
- Pizzorno, A. (1986). Sur la rationalité du choix démocratique. Sur l'individualisme. P. Birbaum and J. Leca. Paris, Presse de la FNSP: 119-138.
- Poisner, J. (1996). "A civic republican perspective on the National Environmental Policy Act's process of citizen participation." Environmental Law **26**: 53-94.
- Pozzoni, B. and N. Kumar (2005). A review of the literature on participatory approaches to local development for an evaluation of the effectiveness of World Bank support for Community-Based and -Driven Development approaches. Washington, DC, World Bank.
- Pretty, J. N. (1994). "Alternative systems of inquiry for a sustainable agriculture." Institute of Development Studies Bulletin **25**: 37-48.
- Pretty, J. N. and H. Ward (2001). "Social capital and the environment." World Development **29**(2): 209-227.
- Probst, K. (2002). "Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: a promising concept in participatory research? Lessons

for two cases studies in Honduras." Kommunikation und Beratung 49.

Probst, K., J. Hagmaan, et al. (2003). Understanding participatory research in the context of natural resource management. Paradigms, approaches and typologies, ODI.

Putnam, R. (1993). Making democracy work: civic traditions in modern Italy, Princeton Univ Press.

Putnam, R. (2002). Democracies in flux: the evolution of social capital in contemporary society. New York, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Rao, V. (2001). Community driven development. A brief review of the research, World Bank.

Rao, V. and M. Walton (2004). Culture and public action. Stanford, Stanford Social Sciences.

Ravindra, A. (2004). An assessment of the impact of Bangalore Citizen Report card on the performance of public agencies. Washington DC, World Bank Operations Evaluation Department.

Reijntjes, C., B. Haverkort, et al. (1995). Une agriculture pour l'avenir: une introduction à l'agriculture durable avec peu d'intrants externes. Paris, Karthala.

Rhoades, R. (1982). The art of the informal agricultural survey. Lima, International Potato Center.

Ribot, J. C. (1998). Decentralization, participation and accountability in sahelian forestry: legal instruments of political-administrative control. Workshop on environmental politics, Berkeley.

Ribot, J. C. (2001). "Integral local development: "accomodating multiple interests" through entrustment and accountable representation." International Journal of Agricultural Resources, Governance and Ecology 1(3/4): 327-350.

Ribot, J. C. (2002). African decentralization. Local actors, powers and accountability, UNRISD.

Ritchey--Vance, M. (1997). "Social capital, sustainability, and working democracy: new yardsticks for grassroots development." Grassroots development 20(1): 3-9.

Ritzen, J., W. Easterly, et al. (2000). On "good" politicians and "bad" policies: social cohesion, institutions and growth. Washington DC, World Bank.

Rodrik, D. (1999). "Where did all the growth go? External shocks, social conflict, and growth collapses." Journal of Economic Growth 4(4): 385-412.

Rölling, N. G. (1996). "Towards an interactive agricultural science." European Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension 2(4): 35-48.

Rölling, N. G. and M. A. Wagemakers (1998). A new practice: facilitating sustainable agriculture. Facilitating Sustainable Agriculture: Participatory learning and adaptive management in times of environmental uncertainty. N. G. Röling and M. A. Wagemakers. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 3-22.

Rosenau, J. N. (1990). Turbulence in World Politics. A theory of change and continuity, Princeton Univ. Press.

Rosenau, J. N. (1992). Governance without government: order and change in world politics. New York, Cambridge Univ. Press.

Rousseau, D. (1995). La démocratie continue. Paris, Bruyant.

Santos, B. and De Sousa (1998). "Participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre: towards a redistributive democracy." Politics and Society 26(4): 461-510.

Sauvé, R. and J. Watts (2003). "An analysis of IPGRI's influence on the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture." Agricultural Systems **78**: 303-327.

Schacht, J. (1973). Anthropologie culturelle de l'argent. Paris, Payot.

Schneider, H. (1999). "Participatory governance for poverty reduction." Journal of International Development **11**: 521-534.

Schuler, D. and A. Namioka (1993). Participatory Design: Principles and Practices; Perspectives on systems design. Hillsdale, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Scoones, I. and J. Thompson (1993). Challenging the populist perspective: rural people's knowledge, agricultural research and extension practice. Brighton, Institute of development Studies.

Selener, D. (1997). Participatory Action Research and Social Change. The Cornell Participatory Action Research Network. New York, Cornell University.

Selin, S. W., M. A. Schuett, et al. (2000). "Modelling stakeholders' perceptions of collaborative initiative effectiveness." Society Natural Resources **13**: 735-745.

Sellamna, N. E. (1999). Relativism in agricultural research and development: is participation a post-modern concept? London, Overseas Development Institute.

Sellamna, N. E. (2000). Du Rapid Rural Appraisal au Participatory Learning and Action: la participation a-t-elle besoin d'un paradigme scientifique? Les enquêtes participatives en débat. Ambition, pratiques, enjeux. P. Lavigne-Delville, N. E. Sellamna and M. Mathieu. Paris, GRET, Karthala, ICRA: 453-496.

Selznick, P. (1966). TVA and the grass roots. New York, Harper and Row.

Sen, A. (1999). Le développement comme liberté. New York, Alfred Knopf.

Senge, P. M. (1990). The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization.

Sennett, R. (1970). The use of disorder: personal identity and city life.

Shah, P. and D. Youssef (2002). Voices and choices at a macro level: participation in country-owned poverty reduction strategies. Washington DC, World Bank.

Shepherd, A. (1998). Participatory environmental management: contradiction of process, project and bureaucracy in the Himalayan foothills. Who changes? Institutionalizing participation in development. J. Blackburn and J. Holland. London, Intermediate Technology.

Sherif, M. (1967). Group conflict and cooperation: their social psychology. London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

Sing, J. and P. Shah (2003). Making services work for the poor: the role of participatory public expenditure management. Washington DC, World Bank.

Sipe, D. G. (1998). "An empirical analysis of environmental mediation." Journal American Planification Association **64**(3): 275-285.

Sipila, M. and L. Tyrvaïnen (2005). "Evaluation of collaborative urban forest planning in Helsinki, Finland." Urban Forestry and Urban Greening **4**(1): 1-12.

Smith, S. E., D. G. Willms, et al. (1997). Nurtured by knowledge. Learning to do participatory action research, IDRC.

- Springer-Heinze, A., F. Hartwich, et al. (2003). "Impact pathway analysis: an approach to strengthening the impact orientation of agricultural research." Agricultural Systems **78**: 267-285.
- Stern, N. (2002). A strategy for development. Washington DC, World Bank.
- Stringer, L. C., A. J. Dougill, et al. (2006). "Unpacking "participation" in the adaptative management of social-ecological systems: a critical review." Ecology and Society **11**(2): 39 [on line].
- Susskind, L., S. McKernan, et al. (1999). The consensus building handbook. Thousands Oaks, Sage.
- Sutherland, A. and A. Martin (2001). Dimensions of participation. Experiences, lessons and tips from agricultural research practitioners in SUB Saharan Africa. Chatham, Natural Resources Institute.
- Tassin, E. (2001). Du village à la cite: la vertu politique et démocratique de l'espace public. Décentralisations: entre dynamiques locales et mondialisations. GEMDEV. Paris: 17-28.
- Tersiguel, P. (1997). Développement durable au Sahel. Paris, Karthala.
- Teyssier, A. (1995). "La gestion de terroir, a review of francophone concept, and a case-study of its application." The Rural extension bulletin **7**: 43-48.
- Teyssier, O., K. Van Keer, et al. (2005). Giving or imposing the opportunity to participate? Reconsidering the meaning of success and failure of a participatory approach. Participatory approaches for sustainable land use in Southeast Asia. A. Neef. Bangkok, White Lotus Press: 129-148.
- Thompson, D. F. (1970). The democratic citizen: social science and democratic theory in the twentyeth century. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, J. (1995). "Participatory approaches in government bureaucracies: facilitating the process of institutional change." World Development **17**(7): 1033-1044.
- Toth, F. L. (1988). "Policy exercises: objectives and design elements." Simulation & Games **19**(3): 235-255.
- Toth, F. L. (1988). "Policy exercises: procedures and implementations." Simulation & Games **19**(3).
- Turner, J. C. (1987). Rediscovering the social group. A self-categorization theory. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Turner, J. C. (1991). Social influence, Open University Press.
- Uphoff, N. and C. M. Wijayarathna (2000). "Demonstrated benefits from social capital: the productivity of farmer organizations in Gal Oya, Sri Lanka." World Development **28**(11): 1987-90.
- Utting, P. (2006). Reclaiming Development Agendas: knowledge, power and international policy making. New York, United Nations.
- van der Liden, J. (1997). "On popular participation in a culture of patronage: patrons and grassroots organization in a sites and services project in Hyderabad, Pakistan." Development and Change **9**(1): 81-90.
- Venkatraman, A. and J. Falconer (1998). Rejuvenating India's decimated forests through joint action: lessons from Andhra Pradesh. Washington DC, World Bank.
- Vernooy, R. and E. Fajber (2005). Making gender/social analysis work for natural resource management research: an umbrella program for building capacity for researchers. Ottawa, IDRC.
- Vernooy, R. and C. Mc Dougall (2003). Principles for good practice in participatory research reflecting on lessons from the field. Managing natural resources for sustainable livelihoods: Uniting science and participation. B. Pound

and al. Ottawa, IDRC: 113-141.

Wagle, S. and P. Shah (2003). Participatory approaches in budgeting and public expenditure management. Five cases studies, World Bank.

Waglé, S., J. Singh, et al. (2004). "Citizen report card surveys. A note on the concept and methodology." Social Development Notes **91**: 4.

Wakeford, T. and M. Pimbert (2004). "Prajateerpu, power and knowledge. The politics of participatory action research in development. Part 2. analysis, reflections and implications." Action Research Series **2**(1): 25-46.

Wassenich, P. and K. Whiteside (2004). Community Driven Development impact assessments study: optimizing evaluation design under constraints. Washington DC, World Bank.

Weber, J. (1992). Environnement, Développement et propriété. Une approche épistémologique. Environnement, développement, éthique. Fides. Montréal, Prades et Vaillancourt: 283-302.

Weber, J. and D. Bailly (1993). "Prévoir, c'est gouverner." Natures, Sciences, Sociétés **1**(1): 59-64.

Webler, T. (1999). "The craft and theory of public participation: a dialectical process." Journal of Risk Research **2**(1): 55-71.

Wheatley, M. J. (1999). Leadership and the new science: discovering order in a chaotic world, Berret-Koehler Publ. Inc.

Williams, E. M. and P. V. Ellefson (1997). "Going into partnership to manage a landscape." Journal Forestry **95**(5): 29-33.

Woolcock, M. (1998). "Social capital and economic development: toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework." Theory and Society **27**(2): 151-208.

World Bank (1996). The World Bank Participation sourcebook. Washington DC, World Bank.

World Bank (2000). World development report 2000/2001: attacking poverty. Washington DC, World Bank, Oxford Univ. Press.

World Bank (2002). Empowerment and poverty reduction: a sourcebook. Washington DC, World Bank.

World Bank (2003). Le contrôle citoyen de l'action publique: une introduction au concept et son application opérationnelle. Washington, World Bank.

World Bank (2004). State-society synergy for accountability: lessons for the World Bank. Washington DC, World Bank.

World Bank (2004). World Development Report 2004: making services work for poor people. Washington DC, World Bank.

World Bank (2005). The effectiveness of World Bank Support for Community-Based and -Driven Development. An OED evaluation. Washington DC, World Bank.

World Bank (2005). A Review of the Literature on Participatory Approaches to Local Development for an Evaluation of the Effectiveness of World Bank Support for Community-Based and Driven Development Approaches. Washington DC, World Bank.